

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT TACOMA

8 TRINA JENKINS, et al.,

9 Plaintiffs,

v.

10 STATE FARM MUTUAL
11 AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE
COMPANY,

12 Defendant.

CASE NO. C15-5508 BHS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

13
14 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration. Dkt.
15 83. The Court denies the motion.

16 Plaintiffs first move for reconsideration on the basis that the Court erred in
17 refusing to consider the expert report of Dr. Siskin. Dkt. 83 at 2–8. To the contrary, the
18 Court considered and accepted all of the substantive and relevant information contained
19 in Dr. Siskin's report. As noted by Plaintiffs, the motion for class certification did not
20 require damages to be shown to a high level of precision, *see* Dkt. 83 at 3. Accordingly,
21 the Court denied Defendant's motion to exclude Dr. Siskin's report. Perhaps Plaintiffs'
22 arguments seek to challenge the Court's comments on the value of Dr. Siskin's report

1 moving forward absent an updated study underlying his linear regression analysis, but
2 this does not constitute a basis for reconsideration of the Court's order denying class
3 certification.

4 Plaintiffs' additional arguments regarding the predominance and superiority
5 inquiries on its motion for class certification are merely a restatement of the arguments
6 made in their original motion and pleadings. These arguments do not point to any
7 particular evidence that was overlooked or manifest error by the Court and do not
8 constitute grounds for reconsideration. Nonetheless, the Court will address Plaintiffs'
9 repeated reliance on *Moeller v. Farmers Ins. Co.*, 173 Wn.2d 264, 280 (2011). Plaintiffs
10 are correct that the decision in *Moeller* rejected the argument that apparent difficulties in
11 assessing an accurate estimate of class-wide damages resulting from possible prior
12 accidents should preclude class certification. However, this case is easily distinguished
13 from *Moeller*. As noted in the Court's previous order, cases such as this where an insurer
14 has claim-filing procedures and recognizes its duty to compensate diminished value
15 claims stand in stark contrast to the circumstances in *Moeller*, where the insurer
16 necessarily denied compensation to all its insureds with UIM policies on the mistaken
17 basis that diminished value was not covered. *See Moeller*, 173 Wn.2d at 269–77.
18 Moreover, Plaintiffs' argument regarding the Court's purported error in mistaking issues
19 of damages calculations for issues that bear on liability fails to address other bases of the
20 Court's determination that common questions do not predominate the claims of the
21 individual class members. *See* Dkt. 82 at 19–21.

1 Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration
2 (Dkt. 83) is **DENIED**.

3 Dated this 14th day of February, 2018.

4
5 

6 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22